1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6	LINITED STATES DIST	PRICT COURT	
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE		
8		CASE NO. 2:23-cv-1933-RSL	
9	10TH GEAR LLC, G4 INNOVATIONS LLC, LITTLE DIESEL TRANSPORTATION, ZEKE AND LIZZIE,	AGREEMENT REGARDING	
10	LLC, VISION AG, LLC, L Z S CEREMONIAL TRAILS, INC., MGM	DISCOVERY OF ELECTRONICALLY STORED	
11	TRANSPORT, LLC, MATTSON'S LAWN & GARDEN, INC., CRC TRANSPORT,	INFORMATION AND ORDER	
12	LLC, and TRPVS, INC. on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated,		
13	Plaintiffs,		
14	T Milleries,		
15	vs.		
16	PACCAR INC a Delaware corporation		
17	Defendant.		
18			
19	The parties hereby stipulate to the following	ng provisions regarding the discovery of	
20	electronically stored information ("ESI") in this matter:		
21	A. General Principles		
22	An attorney's zealous representation of a client is not compromised by conducting		
23	discovery in a cooperative manner. The failure of counsel or the parties to litigation to cooperate		
24	ACREMENT RECARDING DISCOVERY OF SUFCERS ON	CALLY	
25	AGREEMENT REGARDING DISCOVERY OF ELECTRONI STORED INFORMATION AND ORDER (Case No. 2:23-cv-1933-RSL)	PAGE - 1	

in facilitating and reasonably limiting discovery requests and responses raises litigation costs and contributes to the risk of sanctions.

2. As provided in LCR 26(f), the proportionality standard set forth in Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(1) must be applied in each case when formulating a discovery plan. To further the application of the proportionality standard in discovery, requests for production of ESI and related responses should be reasonably targeted, clear, and as specific as possible. This agreement is intended to assist the parties in identifying relevant, responsive information that has been stored electronically and is proportional to the needs of the case. The agreement does not supplant the parties' obligations to comply with Fed. R. Civ. P. 34.

## **B.** ESI Disclosures

Within 90 days of entry of this Order, or at a later time if agreed to by the parties, each party shall disclose:

- 1. <u>Custodians.</u> The custodians most likely to have discoverable ESI in their possession, custody, or control. The custodians shall be identified by name, title, connection to the instant litigation, and the type of the information under the custodian's control.
- 2. <u>Non-custodial Data Sources.</u> A list of non-custodial data sources (*e.g.*, shared drives, servers), if any, likely to contain discoverable ESI.
- 3. <u>Third-Party Data Sources.</u> A list of third-party data sources, if any, likely to contain discoverable ESI (*e.g.*, third-party email providers, mobile device providers, cloud storage) and, for each such source, the extent to which a party is (or is not) able to preserve information stored in the third-party data source.

Inaccessible Data. A list of data sources, if any, likely to contain discoverable ESI

4.

- (by type, date, custodian, electronic system or other criteria sufficient to specifically identify the data source) that a party asserts is not reasonably accessible under Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(2)(B).

  5. Foreign data privacy laws. Nothing in this Order is intended to prevent either party
- 5. <u>Foreign data privacy laws.</u> Nothing in this Order is intended to prevent either party from complying with the requirements of a foreign country's data privacy laws, *e.g.*, the European Union's General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) (EU) 2016/679. The parties agree to meet and confer before including custodians or data sources subject to such laws in any ESI or other discovery request.

## C. ESI Discovery Procedures

- 1. <u>On-site inspection of electronic media.</u> Such an inspection shall not be required absent a demonstration by the requesting party of specific need and good cause or by agreement of the parties.
- 2. <u>Search methodology.</u> The parties shall timely confer to attempt to reach agreement on appropriate search terms and queries, file type and date restrictions, data sources (including custodians), and other appropriate computer- or technology-aided methodologies, before any such effort is undertaken. The parties shall continue to cooperate in revising the appropriateness of the search methodology.
  - a. Prior to running searches:
- i. The producing party shall disclose the data sources (including custodians), search terms and queries, any file type and date restrictions, and any other methodology that it proposes to use to locate ESI likely to contain responsive and discoverable information. The producing party may provide unique hit counts for each search query.

AGREEMENT REGARDING DISCOVERY OF ELECTRONICALLY STORED INFORMATION AND ORDER (Case No. 2:23-cv-1933-RSL)

requesting party. Focused terms and queries should be employed; broad terms or queries, such

as product and company names, generally should be avoided. A conjunctive combination of

multiple words or phrases (e.g., "computer" and "system") narrows the search and shall count as

a single search term. A disjunctive combination of multiple words or phrases (e.g., "computer"

or "system") broadens the search, and thus each word or phrase shall count as a separate search

term unless they are variants of the same word. The producing party may identify each search

term or query returning overbroad results demonstrating the overbroad results and a counter

network design, the types of databases, database dictionaries, the access control list and security

access logs and rights of individuals to access the system and specific files and applications, the

ESI document retention policy, organizational chart for information systems personnel, or the

format to be decided between the parties. Acceptable formats include, native files, and searchable

backup and systems recovery routines, including, but not limited to, tape rotation and

Upon reasonable request, a party shall disclose information relating to

ESI will be produced to the requesting party with searchable text, in a

After disclosure, the parties will engage in a meet and confer

The following provisions apply to search terms / queries of the

1

2 process regarding additional terms sought by the non-producing party.

ii.

iii.

proposal correcting the overbroad search or query.

c.

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

3. Format.

destruction/overwrite policy.

a.

19

20

. .

21

22

PDF.

23

24

25

AGREEMENT REGARDING DISCOVERY OF ELECTRONICALLY STORED INFORMATION AND ORDER (Case No. 2:23-cv-1933-RSL)

PAGE - 4

- b. Unless otherwise agreed to by the parties, files that are not easily converted to image format, such as spreadsheet, database, and drawing files, will be produced in native format.
- c. Each document image file shall be named with a unique number (Bates Number). File names should not be more than twenty characters long or contain spaces. When a text-searchable image file is produced, the producing party must preserve the integrity of the underlying ESI, *i.e.*, the original formatting, the metadata (as noted below) and, where applicable, the revision history.
- d. If a document is more than one page, the unitization of the document and any attachments and/or affixed notes shall be maintained as they existed in the original document.
- 4. <u>De-duplication.</u> The parties may de-duplicate their ESI production across custodial and non-custodial data sources after disclosure to the requesting party, and the duplicate custodian information removed during the de-duplication process tracked in a duplicate/other custodian field in the database load file.
- 5. <u>Email Threading.</u> The parties may use analytics technology to identify email threads and need only produce the unique most inclusive copy and related family members and may exclude lesser inclusive copies. Upon reasonable request, the producing party will produce a less inclusive copy.
- 6. <u>Metadata fields.</u> If the requesting party seeks metadata, the parties agree that only the following metadata fields need be produced, and only to the extent it is reasonably accessible and non-privileged: document type; custodian and duplicate custodians (or storage location if no custodian); author/from; recipient/to, cc and bcc; title/subject; email subject; file name; file size;

file extension; original file path; date and time created, sent, modified and/or received; and hash value. The list of metadata type is intended to be flexible and may be changed by agreement of the parties, particularly in light of advances and changes in technology, vendor, and business practices.

7. Hard-Copy Documents. If the parties elect to produce hard-copy documents in an electronic format, the production of hard-copy documents will include a cross-reference file that indicates document breaks and sets forth the custodian or custodian/location associated with each produced document. Hard-copy documents will be scanned using Optical Character Recognition technology and searchable ASCII text files will be produced (or Unicode text format if the text is in a foreign language), unless the producing party can show that the cost would outweigh the usefulness of scanning (for example, when the condition of the paper is not conducive to scanning and will not result in accurate or reasonably useable/searchable ESI). Each file will be named with a unique Bates Number (e.g., the unique Bates Number of the first page of the corresponding production version of the document followed by its file extension).

## **D.** Preservation of ESI

The parties acknowledge that they have a common law obligation, as expressed in Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(e), to take reasonable and proportional steps to preserve discoverable information in the party's possession, custody, or control. With respect to preservation of ESI, the parties agree as follows:

1. Absent a showing of good cause by the requesting party, the parties shall not be required to modify the procedures used by them in the ordinary course of business to back-up and archive data; provided, however, that the parties shall preserve all discoverable ESI in their possession, custody, or control.

AGREEMENT REGARDING DISCOVERY OF ELECTRONICALLY STORED INFORMATION AND ORDER (Case No. 2:23-cv-1933-RSL)

23

24

ESI, the privilege log may be generated using available metadata, including author/recipient or to/from/cc/bcc names; the subject matter or title; and date created. Should the available metadata provide insufficient information for the purpose of evaluating the privilege claim asserted, the producing party shall include such additional information as required by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Privilege logs will be produced to all other parties no later than 60 days after delivering a production unless an earlier or later deadline is agreed to by the parties.

- 2. Redactions need not be logged so long as the basis for the redaction is clear on the redacted document.
- 3. With respect to privileged or work-product information generated after the filing of the complaint, parties are not required to include any such information in privilege logs.
- 4. Activities undertaken in compliance with the duty to preserve information are protected from disclosure and discovery under Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(3)(A) and (B).
- 5. Pursuant to Fed. R. Evid. 502(d), the production of any documents, electronically stored information (ESI) or information, whether inadvertent or otherwise, in this proceeding shall not, for the purposes of this proceeding or any other federal or state proceeding, constitute a waiver by the producing party of any privilege applicable to those documents, including the attorney-client privilege, attorney work-product protection, or any other privilege or protection recognized by law. This Order shall be interpreted to provide the maximum protection allowed by Fed. R. Evid. 502(d). The provisions of Fed. R. Evid. 502(b) do not apply. Nothing contained herein is intended to or shall serve to limit a party's right to conduct a review of documents, ESI or information (including metadata) for relevance, responsiveness and/or segregation of privileged and/or protected information before production. Information produced in discovery

1	that is protected as privileged or work product shall be immediately returned to the producing		
2	party.		
3	Dated: April 19, 2024 Re	spectfully submitted,	
4	TE	RRELL MARSHALL LAW GROUP PLLC	
5	Ву	s/Beth E. Terrell Beth E. Terrell (WSBA No. 26759)	
6		bterrell@terrellmarshall.com	
7		s/ Seth M. Dawson Seth M. Dawson (WSBA No. 56055)	
8		sdawson@terrellmarshall.com	
9		936 N. 34 <sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 300 Seattle, Washington 98103	
10		Telephone: (206) 816-6603 Facsimile: (206) 319-5450	
11		David Marcus, <i>admitted pro hac vice</i> dmarcus@dlmlaw.com	
12		Benjamin Donovan, admitted pro hac v	ice
13		bdonovan@dlmlaw.com DLM LAW LLC	
14		4700 Belleview Avenue, Suite 200 Kansas City, Missouri 64112	
15		Telephone: (816) 268-6775 Facsimile: (816) 222-0534	
16		Attorneys for Plaintiffs	
17	Dated: April 19, 2024 K&	&L GATES LLP	
18	Ву	z <u>s/ Todd Nunn</u> Todd Nunn (WSBA No. 23267)	
19		todd.nunn@klgates.com 925 Fourth Avenue, Suite 2900	
20		Seattle, Washington 98104-1158	
21		Telephone: (206) 625-8600 Facsimile: (206) 625-0900	
22		Pamela S. Tonglao (WSBA No. 29476)	
23		pamela.tonglao@paccar.com  Jesse Blaisdell (WSBA No. 44044)	
24		jesse.blaisdell@paccar.com	
25	AGREEMENT REGARDING DISCOVERY OF ELECTRONICALLY STORED INFORMATION AND ORDER PA		PAGE - 9
26	(Case No. 2:23-cv-1933-RSL)		

## Case 2:23-cv-01933-RSL Document 34 Filed 04/23/24 Page 10 of 10

1	PACCAR INC 777 106 <sup>th</sup> Ave NE	
2	Bellevue, WA 98004-5027 Telephone: (425) 468-7356	
3	Facsimile: (425) 468-8228	
4	Anthony Pisciotti, pro hac vice	
5	Danny Lallis, <i>pro hac vice</i> Clifford M. Laney, <i>pro hac vice</i>	
6	PISCIOTTI LALLIS ERDREICH 30 Columbia Turnpike, Suite 205 Florham Park, NJ 07932	
7	Telephone: (973) 245-8100	
8	Facsimile: (973) 245-8101 apisciotti@pisciotti.com	
9	dlallis@pisciotti.com claney@ pisciotti.com	
10	Attorneys for Defendant PACCAR Inc	
11		
12	ORDER	
13	Based on the foregoing, IT IS SO ORDERED.	
14	Dated this 23rd day of April, 2024.	
15	MWS (asnik) Robert S. Lasnik	
16	Robert S. Lasnik UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE	
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25	AGREEMENT REGARDING DISCOVERY OF ELECTRONICALLY	
26	STORED INFORMATION AND ORDER (Case No. 2:23-cv-1933-RSL)	
-		